

Minutes

City of Loma Linda

Department of Community Development

Planning Commission

Chair Rosenbaum called a regular meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 7:05 p.m., **Wednesday, August 25, 2004**, in the City Council Chambers, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

Commissioners Present: Mary Lee Rosenbaum, Chair
Randy Neff, Vice Chair
Michael Christianson
Charles Umeda
Rene Sakala

Staff Present: Richard Holdaway, City Attorney
Deborah Woldruff, Director, Community Development Dept.
Rolland Crawford, Director/Fire Chief, Public Safety
Jarb Thaipejr, Director, Public Works Department
Lori Lamson, Senior Planner
Jocelyne Larabie, Administrative Secretary

ITEMS TO BE DELETED OR ADDED

No items were added or deleted.

ORAL REPORTS/PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There was no public participation.

CONTINUED ITEMS

PUBLIC HEARING

PC-04-45 - General Plan Update Project -The project is a comprehensive update to the City's General Plan, which was originally adopted in 1973. A Draft General Plan document has been prepared based on public input received in various public workshops over the past two years. The draft document has been designed to respond to and reflect the City's changing conditions and community goals in order to guide the City's development during the next twenty years. The project boundaries include all of the City's corporate limits and the Sphere of Influence in the San Bernardino County unincorporated areas generally located south of Redlands Boulevard, east of California Street, south of Barton Road and west of the San Timoteo Creek Channel, and the southeast portion of the South Hills area into San Timoteo Canyon and south to the Riverside County line. The Draft General Plan document addresses issues and sets broad policies related to Land Use, Community Design, Circulation, Economic Development, Housing, Conservation, Open Space, Noise, Safety, Public Services and Facilities, and Historic Preservation.

Director Woldruff gave a brief staff report stating that the discussion on the Draft General Plan had been continued from the August 4, 2004 meeting to allow more time for Commissioners Umeda and Sakala to get familiar with the document. She stated that this meeting would address concerns raised regarding the Hillside Mixed-Use Designation. She explained that the designation had been renamed because the public was concerned with the term "mixed-use". She added that an alternative to the term "mixed-use" in other areas of the text of the General Plan was being offered to the Planning Commission as "Special Planning Areas", if the commission should wish to change it.

Director Woldruff stated that there had been a change in the Community Design Component for residential and the implementation chapter adding a policy that acknowledged the Trails component and that a Master Trails Plan for the south hills area including the identification of proposed trails route and design standards mechanisms for trail acquisition and provisions for ongoing trail maintenance; this policy would be added to Chapter 11 – General Plan Implementation Programs.

Director Woldruff informed the Commission that correspondence had been received from property owners on Barton Road at the west end of the City requesting that the properties on both sides of Barton Road, West of Oakwood Drive, east of the Gage Canal and the Montecito Mortuary requesting that the designation be changed from Office Use to a High Density residential designation. Director Woldruff stated that the main issue was the number of access points onto Barton Road. After re-evaluating the situation, staff recommended that the Planning Commission consider adding policy language to Section 2.2.1.4 – High-Density Residential as follows:

Conversion of existing single family uses to multi-family development within the High Density Residential area located along the north and south sides of Barton Road at Loma Linda's western city limits shall be contingent upon preparation of a plan for consolidation of existing driveways. Prior to approval of multi-family development, the project sponsors for multi-family development shall demonstrate that:

- Access for proposed multi-family uses will be provided in a safe and efficient manner; and,
- There is sufficient agreement among property owners to implement such a plan.

Mr. Zola explained that he had made changes to Section 2.2.3, the Hillside Mixed-Use Land Use Designation and that two alternatives had been considered for the Hillside:

- Alternative 1, a density-clustering concept, which reflected the terminology suggested at early workshops. He added that as a result of a joint City Council and Planning Commission, staff was directed to move away from a slope-density formula and provide a greater reliance on the specific development review process. Mr. Zola explained that Alternative 1 was more restrictive in terms of density and left less discretion in the review of future projects by the Planning Commission and the City Council; and,
- Alternative 2, which would provide very low rural densities without clustering for the bench areas of 1du/5 acres.

Director Woldruff suggested that if the Planning Commission was comfortable with the proposed changes, they could forward the General Plan Update project to City Council with recommendations as contained in the staff reports and the proposed modifications to that component. She continued to say that if the Planning Commission was not comfortable with the proposed Hillside Designation language, the other components of the General Plan Update project could be sent forward to the City Council to allow them to start their review of the document. She added that the Commission had other options in terms of drafting a recommendation to the City Council that would allow for further study of the South Hills.

Chair Rosenbaum opened the discussion to the Commissioners.

Commissioner Christianson requested clarification as to the difference in implementation for mixed-use vs. special planning area. Mr. Zola replied that it was not a substantive change but more of a nomenclature option to avoid the confusion with other mixed-use areas in commercial development in other parts of the city. He added that Mixed-Use Area E was the only section that had received substantive changes.

Commissioner Christianson addressed Section d) on Page 2-9 in relation to open space in a cluster-type development asking how much open space it would entail. Chair Rosenbaum suggested that, as this was a General Plan, the question of how much open space would be addressed in another document. Director Woldruff agreed that the issue of open space would be studied at the Development Code stage.

Commissioner Umeda asked Mr. Zola how he had arrived at the cluster size of 100 to 200. Mr. Zola replied that the number of units might correspond to a developer's phasing plan a small neighborhood in a larger master planned community. There was further discussion on the concept of clustering.

Commissioner Umeda commented on the following:

- Difference on the number of homes between Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 – Mr. Zola stated 20-25% reduction in Alternative 1 and 70-80% reduction in Alternative 2.
- Clustering – Mr. Zola explained that the maximum allowable density would be calculated using the slope density formula, then the number of units would be clustered in less sensitive and more developable areas.

Mr. Zola added that when using a slope density formula as in Alternative 1, there was a far greater expectation by developers of being able to develop the maximum number of units.

Commissioner Umeda further commented on:

- Adding stronger language regarding commercial development on Page 2-39, Section f. – Mr. Zola Suggested that the language may read: “small commercial for support uses for local neighborhood” to discourage large food markets.
- Page 2-38, Section c. – The use of the term “mass-graded pads” was misleading – Mr. Zola explained that it was easier for developers to understand and it would maintain consistency for future development. He suggested changing the term “mass-graded pads” to “manufactured pads” might be appropriate.
- Page 2-39, Section h. – Clarification on the change to the vantage area regarding view sheds – Mr. Zola explained that the language changed the viewing angle to a steeper one for the residents closest to the neighborhood, as these residents would be the ones most likely to see the houses against the ridgeline.

Commissioner Umeda asked if Alternative 1 allowed clustering on the bench area. Mr. Zola replied that through the Planned Development procedure the current code permitted to go to a smaller lot size in exchange for common open space once it was annexed to the City of Loma Linda.

Chair Rosenbaum had a question regarding Alternative 1. She wanted to know if the degree of slope was before contouring – Mr. Zola replied that it was the natural slope prior to any development. A discussion ensued regarding the tactics that might be used by developers to obtain the densities that they want.

Director Woldruff asked to clarify one issue that would be amended in the next version of the Draft General Plan. She stated that the limit of the Initiative area of the South Hills was inaccurate because a portion of the Initiative Area touched the Riverside County Line and was not properly illustrated in the last edition of the Draft General Plan.

Chair Rosenbaum opened the public comment period at 7:52 p.m.

Doree Morgan, 26092 Bancroft, Loma Linda asked if the currently proposed developments were prepared on the Draft General Plan. Director Woldruff explained that staff was directed by the City Council to ensure that new developments going through the process were consistent with the Draft General Plan. Ms. Morgan continued to say that in reading the Draft General Plan, its vision does not promote those values mentioned in the text and wanted to know if the Planning Commission was being pressured by outside entities to approve high-density projects. Chair Rosenbaum replied that the City of Loma Linda was mandated by the State to provide housing for all levels of income.

Director Woldruff addressed Ms. Morgan's concerns and explained that:

- The Housing Element must be certified by the Department of Housing and Community Development and if it wasn't, critical funding could be withheld, and participation in some programs denied;
- The maximum density in the existing General Plan was 20 units per acre. A developer could received a density bonus of up to 25% if certain parameters were met;
- Mandated from SCAG to provide regional essential needs assessment units of 40% housing for Very Low Income Levels, 30% for Low Income Levels, and 30% for moderate Income Levels for a total of approximately 1,500 units of affordable housing for a 5-year period.

Mr. Zola concurred with Director Woldruff and pointed out as an example that in areas such as Orange and Los Angeles Counties, multi-family units were being constructed that translated into 30 to 50 units per acre.

Ms. Morgan would like language that would state that the people of Loma Linda wanted a natural environment as stated in the Draft General Plan on Page 1-10, in the Vision of Loma Linda's Future.

Commissioner Christianson wanted to know what the consequences would be if, in order to keep the uniqueness and vision of the city, Loma Linda were to ignore the Sacramento mandate for higher densities. He added that the City could weather the financial shortfalls. Mr. Zola explained that the State did not mandate the density but it did mandate the City to provide housing for all economic segments of the community. He emphasized that the City of Loma Linda had an obligation to meet State Law.

There was a brief discussion during which Ms. Morgan commented that she didn't believe that transit-oriented development would ever occur. Director Woldruff explained that to obtain public transportation service to all areas of Loma Linda, Omni Trans would require a larger number of homes to ensure viable ridership.

Georgia Hodgkin, 24360 Lawton, Loma Linda thanked the Planning Commission for reopening the public comment on the issue. Because of her role in the education field, she stated that the current emphasis of the General Plan should be on the outcomes of its adoption. She added that the Historical Commission had the opportunity to review three proposals within the Mission Road Historic Overlay District asking to be certified by the Historical Commission and a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted. She added that she could provide a petition signed by 230 residents who agree that small lot subdivisions were not appropriate outcomes of the application of the General Plan. Ms. Hodgkin stated that the City of Loma Linda needed a General Plan that reflected the character and heritage of its residents. She asked that the citizens be assured that Loma Linda not look like a migrant workers' camp. She referred to a letter that she had forwarded to the Planning Commission speaking out against the development of the South Hills and requested that the term "Planned Community" be stricken from the General Plan.

Jonathan Zirkle, 24247 Barton Road, Loma Linda spoke on the following topics:

- Penalties for not having an approved General Plan - His research showed that there are no substantial penalties for not complying with State Law;
- Hillside Development – He stated that trail map on the Land Use map should be preserved as open space to protect the fauna and the flora of the area;
- Alternative 1 vs. Alternative 2 – He suggested a mix of the two alternatives would be appropriate for the land in the Sphere of Influence behind the city limits with a density of 1/20 acres;
- Clustering – He urged Planning Commission not to allow clustering and thus avoid outrage of the citizens;
- Water supply in South Hills – He stated that it wasn't fair to make all the residents pay through water rates for providing water to developments in the hills;
- Sphere of Influence – If there was a possibility that a project would become non-conforming in the Sphere of Influence because of a change in the General Plan, the project should not be approved at all.

Ted Miller owner of properties at 24190, 24200 & 24208 Barton Road, Loma Linda, stated that he owned the four lots on Barton Road and that he was concerned about the properties on the extreme northwest side of Barton Road. He addressed the following issues:

- Office use on Barton Road – He wanted to be reassured that the property on the north side of the street would be included in the change land use to multi-family land use – Director Woldruff stated that staff had recommended to the Planning Commission to change the designation to high-density;
- Would approval of high density projects be contingent on creating a consolidation plan – Director Woldruff replied that the number of access points (driveways) to Barton Road would have to be eliminated over time as change in ownership and use occurred;
- Adult Entertainment – Ensure that the General Plan had a designation to avoid lawsuits.

Wendy Hamilton, 25777 Mission Road, Loma Linda spoke on these topics regarding the development of Mission Road:

- Widening of the road;
- The area on the north side was an Indian burial ground and should not be disturbed;
- Traffic concerns;
- Affordable housing would devalue current homes;
- Large homes would house many families because of home prices and again affect property values.

Glenn Elssmann, 25814 Business Center Drive, Loma Linda, stated that he welcome the changes to the General Plan and stated that it was possible to preserve the South Hills and find a workable balance between development and preservation of open space.

Motion by Umeda, seconded by Christianson, and carried by a vote of 5-0, to forward the Draft General Plan to the City Council with the following recommendations:

Prepare and adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations and Findings (pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15043, 15091, 15092, and 15093) for the significant unavoidable adverse impacts related to Air Quality, Loss of Open Space, Biological Resources, Water Supply, and Traffic and

Circulation that would result from implementation of the Loma Linda Draft General Plan;

Approve and Certify the Final Program Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), which includes the Draft EIR, Response to Comments, and Mitigation Monitoring Program; and,

Approve and Adopt all Elements of the Draft General Plan (June 2004), as follows:

**Introduction To the General Plan Elements (Element 1.0);
Land Use Element (Element 2.0);
Community Design Element (Element 3.0);
Economic Development Element (Element 4.0);
Housing Element (Element 5.0);
Transportation And Circulation Element (Element 6.0);
Noise Element (Element 7.0);
Public Services And Facilities Element (Element 8.0);
Conservation And Open Space Element (Element 9.0);
Public Health And Safety Element (Element 10.0); and,
General Plan Implementation Programs Element (Element 11.0);**

Retain at Planning Commission level Mixed-Use areas B, D, E, G, & J, the Hillside Designation, and the possible incorporation of the Awanee principles and to continue the discussion on Mixed-Use areas D and E to the Regular Meeting of September 1, 2004, and continue the discussion of the Hillside Designation to the Special Meeting of September 15, 2005

PC-04-46 - APPROVAL OF MINUTES – Minutes of the Regular meeting of June 9, 2004

Motion by Christianson, seconded by Neff, and carried by a vote of 3-2, Commissioners Umeda and Sakala abstaining to approve the Minutes of the Special Meeting of April 28, 2004 as presented.

Motion by Christianson, seconded by Neff, and unanimously carried to approve the Minutes of the Adjourned regular meeting of June 9, 2004 as presented.

REPORTS BY THE PLANNING COMMISSIONERS

Commissioner Christianson asked Director Woldruff if it would be possible to request that Tentative Tract Maps (TTM) could be submitted separately from the Precise Plan of Design (PPD) application. Director Woldruff explained that under the Permit Streamlining Act timeline when both are submitted, both must be addressed at the same time. Attorney Holdaway explained that once the application was submitted and deemed complete, the process has 120 days to be completed.

Commissioner Sakala asked when the community design portion would be reviewed. Director Woldruff replied that design guidelines and standards were established in the Development Code and suggested that one or two Commissioners work with staff on the Code.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORT

Director Woldruff stated that she had nothing urgent to report.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Christianson, seconded by Neff, and unanimously carried to adjourn to the Regular meeting of September 1, 2004.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:55 pm

Minutes approved at the regular meeting of March 2, 2005.

Administrative Secretary